DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 548 EC 142 408

AUTHOR Roubinek, Darrell L.; And Others
TITLE Public Law 94-142, Another Imperfect Panacea for American Educators.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 38p.; Print is marginal in parts. Study presented at the Annual Convention of the College Reading Association Convention (25th, Louisville, KY, October 29-31, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Compliance (Legal); *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; Mainstreaming; *Mild Disabilities; Student Placement; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

The report cites research on educators' knowledge and understanding of P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act), the ability of a typical school staff to implement P.L. 94-142, and elements restrictive to providing the instructional program. Noted among findings were the following: although a student provided with special education services was passing in all subject areas, the amount of time needed to provide a least restrictive, most appropriate education environment was questioned; that a majority of teachers in a survey indicated that educable mentally retarded students did not benefit academically from mainstreaming; that one-third of elementary and secondary teachers from one survey had no knowledge of readability formulas; that school administrators viewed the grading system to be a more restrictive variable than do regular classroom or special teachers; and that high on the list of restrictive variables are family factors, children's views of themselves, large classes, negative peer pressure, inflexible grade level standards, and using the same textbook for all students in a class. Appended are tables with statistical data and a sample "opinionnaire." (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215548

Public Law 94-142, Another Imperfect Panacea for American Educators

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by
Darrell L. Roubinek
Dale G. Range
Patrick O. Copley
James R. Layton

Study presented at 25th Annual College Reading Association Convention

The Galt House, Louisville, Kentucky
October 29-31, 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James R. Layton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC142408

Public Law 94-142, Another Imperfect Panacea for American Educators

Darrell L. Roubinek, Professor

Dale G. Range, Professor; Department Head

Patrick O. Copley, Professor; Dean, School of Education and Psychology

James R. Layton, Professor

Department of Elementary and Reading Education

Southwest Missouri State University

Springfield, MO 65807

Introduction

For the past five academic school years the investigators who conducted this study were actively involved in many aspects of education related to the dictates found in Public Law 94-142. The major projects undertaken were as follows:

1. The Dean's Grant (PL 94-142)
2. Public School Awareness Projects (PL 94-142)
3. Writing PL 94-142 Compliance Plans
4. Competency Training of Educational Resource Teachers (ERT's)
5. PL 94-142 Administrator's Workshops
6. Early Childhood Education Special Education Workshops
7. Peer Evaluation Teams (PL 94-142)
8. An SMSU publication: The Learner and the Process
9. Numerous other Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education programs

The investigators were involved with many projects and programs related to PL 94-142 at local, state, regional, and national levels. And as time went by, they began to look more closely at the dictates (contents) of

PL 94-142, their roles in providing information and training to educators who were required to meet the intent and spirit of the law, and the actual practices that were observed in the field, based on reports gained from communicating with parents, educators, or other persons.

Major concerns resulted from the contacts that were made.

1. How many people truly understand the contents of and intentions of the writers and supporters of PL 94-142, especially mainstreaming, least restrictive environment, and or most appropriate educational environment?
2. Can teachers who are required to complete successfully one required course in exceptional children understand and assume their appropriate and required roles in child find, screening, diagnosis, placement, due process, etc.?
3. Are procedures that are dictated in PL 94-142 and also interpreted concerning placing children in least restrictive environments possible for regular classroom teachers to attain if they have little, if any training, in providing educational programs for mildly handicapped students?
4. Does an atmosphere exist within schools that results from a unique interaction of many subvariables within the major variables (instructional program, administrative provisions, and/or out-of-school conditions) that may reduce the probability of providing a least restrictive, most appropriate educational setting for mildly handicapped children or adolescents with learning problems?

The remainder of this report will contain a presentation of data and interpretations thereof exploring the questions posited.

The Questions

Questions One and Two: Knowledge and Understanding of Public Law 94-142: a comparative study.

Based on educators' self perceptions of their knowledge of PL 94-142, a comparative study was undertaken to determine the status of graduates at Southwest Missouri State University to a small, national sample of educators from various locations in the United States.

A five-point Likert scale was developed for each of the eight areas of knowledge on which the teachers were to rate themselves. The ninth item on the opinionnaire was a statement designed to determine the degree to which the teachers thought that their school districts were in compliance with PL 94-142. There were forty teachers in each group.

PLACE TABLE 1 APPROXIMATELY HERE

Table 1 is a display of the mean scores on each of the variables. It appears that Referral was the only area in which the Ozark group rated themselves above average and only in Screening and Diagnosis did the group rate themselves near an average ranking of knowledge. Census and Due Process received below average ranks. The question arose: After several years of inservice training and at least one course in exceptionality, why did the teachers not consider themselves at least in the strong average range?

The Nashville group rated themselves in the average group on five of the eight items: Identification, Screening, Referral, Diagnosis, and Due Process (range: 3.07 to 3.5). Even though the Nashville group ranked themselves higher than the Ozark group rated themselves, in all five of the variables, only two of the differences obtained were statistically significantly different: Screening and Due Process.

In matters of Budget/Finance, both groups rated themselves below average, but again the Nashville group's mean (2.57) was statistically superior to the Ozark group's ($\bar{X}$=1.87).

On Item 9, Degree of LEA Compliance, the Nashville group rated their school districts as in the high average, approaching above average in compliance with PL 94-142. The Ozark group's mean barely fell into the average range ($\bar{X}$=3.15).

Based on the information in Table 1, the Nashville group's mean self perceptions were significantly higher in four of the nine cases. However, the question arose: How can teachers provide appropriate educational settings if they consider themselves to have low-average knowledge in the intricacies of PL 94-142?

Table 2 contains the ranking of the variables from high to low. The Ozark group considered themselves in the mid-range of average in

ENTER TABLE 2 APPROXIMATELY HERE

only two of the categories (Referral and Screening). Again, such data led the investigators to question the probability of appropriate educational placement of mildly handicapped students with learning problems.

Question Three: Can the dictates as well as the interpretations and/or recommendations by authorities for implementing PL 94-142 be implemented by a typical school staff?

The following report is a summary of a report by the investigators presented at a National Dean's Grant Conference, Washington, D.C., May, 1981. The report resulted from an attempt to employ the recommendations of noted authorities in the area of special education/learning disabilities.

A compilation of recommendations to regular secondary classroom

teachers by writers in the area of learning disabilities may be summarized thusly (Abenson, 1977, Ballard, 1978; Mann, 1978 and Fritsch, 1981):

1. Determine what is to be learned in the content area class in which the mildly learning disabled student is placed.
2. Evaluate student's ability to read the assigned textbook (i.e. knowledge of key words and independent/instructional levels).
3. Develop a set of educational objectives based on the essential content to be learned.
4. Alter, adjust, and/or reorganize the materials by rewriting it to specific grade levels if appropriate, if less difficult materials are unavailable.
5. Redesign tests or tests administration to be commensurate with the students' best receptive/expressive language abilities.
6. Have consensus from all educators involved with the student and parents that the procedures specified in items 1-5 above are appropriate (I.E.P. and placement conference).

The student who was the subject used in this study was transferred from a senior high school in which he attended regular tenth grade classes and was assigned to a resource room one period each day. The student had no friends, was viewed as having a low self concept, and had an academic record containing an abundance of failing grades.

Following the initial evaluation, the school officials, counselor, teachers, and parents agreed that the following program would be in the student's best interest.

1. Graduate assistants would act as educational consultants/ resource room teachers and serve the student in several capacities.

a. basic reading skills teachers

b. English teachers

c. tutors in biology and history

d. redesigners of materials

e. liaison duties among all persons involved with the student's welfare

f. designing practice/rehearsal materials for holiday periods

2. The student's educational program was designed in the following manner.

a. English/basic skills one hour daily, five days per week on a pass/fail basis

b. biology and history in regular classes on a pass/fail basis

c. typing, health, and physical education in regular classes on a pass/fail basis

Table 3 is a display of the pre- and post scores after a six-month period.

PLACE TABLE 3 APPROXIMATELY HERE

To affect the changes appearing in Table 3, the two graduate students devoted the following combined amounts of time.

1. Direct teaching: 162 hours.

2. Rewriting materials, typing, planning: 393 hours.

Approximately four hours each day were spent directly attending to

the student's needs. Those hours did not include the following:

1. initial evaluation and report
2. I.E.P. conference and subsequent plan
3. independent activities planned for weekends and holidays
4. contacts with motor vehicle bureau (the subject read and passed driver's examination)
5. classroom teachers' time selecting objectives and counselling with graduate assistants
6. other consultations graduate students, counselors, administrators, etc.

At the end of the first six-month period the student was passing in all subject areas, had passed the reading portions of the Missouri Basic Educational Skills Test (BEST), and had passed his Missouri driver's examination (by reading). However, many hours had been devoted to the student's welfare and the question had to be asked: If the amount of time expended caring for one student's needs is multiplied by the number of students with similar needs, is there enough time, teacher expertise, and human energy to complete the task successfully?

The results of two other studies conducted during the time of the case study added information that led the investigators to continue their concerns that it was difficult to provide mildly handicapped (learning problems) students with a least restrictive, most appropriate educational environment. In one survey, 41 secondary teachers reported that 3.69% of the students assigned to them were EMR students who were being mainstreamed.

Of the 41 teachers reporting, 68% of them had only a single textbook for the students. It was further reported that only 34% of the teachers had ever attended an IEP conference.

Additionally, the majority of the teachers participating in the survey indicated that EMR students did not benefit academically from mainstreaming (76%); but the group was divided in their opinions that social benefits were possible (54% positive). However, 71% of the teachers indicated the almost average students would not benefit from the presence of mainstreamed EMR students in their classes. Finally, 80% of the teachers appeared to think that the attention given to mainstreamed students would prevent their giving time to the other students.

Only 15% of the 41 respondents indicated that they were sufficiently prepared by their professors to teach EMR students. On another item, only 10% reported that inservice training had been effective in preparing them to teach mainstreamed EMR students. However, 41% of the respondents did think that there were adequate special education personnel in their schools to help them with the problems encountered.

When queried as to the most significant learning problems the mainstreamed students experienced, reading received the majority of the responses (55.2%); home conditions (13.1%); and student behavior (7.8%).

When asked the degree to which recommended teaching skills they could perform, the teachers responded in the following manner. Only 18% could design, compose, and score cloze tests; only 32%

could organize the class for instruction; 47% could use readability formulas and match materials to students' levels; and 63% could determine the study skills students would need to participate successfully in their classes. However, when asked to rank the importance of utilizing the skills specified above (1 - not important to 5 - essential), the mean range was 2.71 (utilizing classroom management techniques); 2.79 (cloze tests); 3.09 (using readability formulas); 3.2 (determing instructional reading levels); 3.63 (study skills); and 3.86 (matching materials to students).

According to the chief investigator (Hugger, 1979) of the study just reported, the group of teachers who reported were ill-prepared to receive mainstreamed students in their classes or to provide least restrictive environments for them. There was also enough evidence to assume that the group of teachers' attitudes were less than positive.

In another study, Moore (1980) discovered that 1/3 (N=91) of the elementary and secondary teachers surveyed had no knowledge of readability formulas, but elementary teachers did have more knowledge than secondary teachers. Moore also found that of the 2/3's who were familiar with the readability formulas, 68% (secondary) and 52% (elementary) of the teachers respectively used them at least once each year. However, the most frequent use made of the formulas (based on a 5 point scale) was for selecting or evaluating published materials (mean range: 3.71 - 4.15); rewriting materials received a mean of 2.96 (elementary) and 3.23 (secondary). The secondary teachers did indicate a 4.08 in using formulas to rewrite

directions while the elementary group's mean was only 2.75.

Based partly on the information in the answers to the first three questions and the investigators' self perceptions, a procedure was set in motion to answer the fourth question within this study.

Question four: Does an atmosphere exist within schools that results from a unique interaction of many subvariables within the major variables (instructional program, administrative provisions, and/or out-of-school conditions) which may reduce the probability of providing a least restrictive, most appropriate educational setting for mildly handicapped children or adolescents with learning problems?

Part 1 of this study was reported by Roubinek (1980). It consisted of a set of three conditions that were perceived by classroom teachers as possible deterrents to their attempts to provide an appropriate educational setting for mildly handicapped students with learning problems. The teachers, working independently and in small groups, also listed the subvariables within each of the three variables they considered to be deterrents.

The three major classifications, subclassifications, and opinionnaire that was subsequently developed (for Part 2 of this study) appear.

BEGIN OPINIONNAIRE APPROXIMATELY HERE

The survey forms were distributed to 18 regular classroom teachers, 102 special teachers (L.D., remedial mathematics,

language arts, and reading), 52 administrators and 22 teacher aides. The following is an analysis of the data that was collected. Random sampling was assumed.

The respondents as a group viewed the instructional program ($\bar{X}$=3.88) to be the most causative variable that would deter attempts to provide an appropriate educational setting for mainstreamed youngsters. The environment outside the school ($\bar{X}$=3.16) was second and only slightly above administrative structure ($\bar{X}$=2.97). When subjected to the analysis of variance technique, there were no statistical differences among the views of the three groups toward any of the three major areas (Appendix A).

The next step in the study was to determine if there were any differences among the opinions of the four groups responding toward the subvariables within each of the three major areas. The following is summary of those findings.

Restrictive Elements which Flow from the Instructional Program

There were 21 items contained in the first section of the opinionnaire. Significant differences among the four groups occurred in six of the variables (items 4,5,6,7.8,11,18, and 21).

Apparently, school administrators view the grading system to be a more restrictive variable ($\bar{X}$=3.94) than do regular classroom or special teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.5). But teacher aides only view grading to be slightly causative ($\bar{X}$=2.90). (F=2.559; significant, .0564.)

Unmotivated teachers was another item in which disagreement was found. Even though exact interpretations are difficult to make

from ANOVA treatment, it is apparent that teacher aides ($\bar{X}$=4.4) rated the item as very close to highly causative, special teachers and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.7, 3.9) rated the item as above average in causation. (Significant, F=.04)

On item 6, same textbook for all students, there was also disagreement. However, it is difficult to determine the source of the difference even though regular and special teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.2) do score the item in the above average category and administrators and aides score it in the upper limits of average. (Significant, F=.05)

A significant difference was also obtained on item 7, personality. Apparently administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.3), special teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.5), and aides ($\bar{X}$=3.8) view the regular teacher's personality ($\bar{X}$=3.0) as mediumly causative in the teachers' inability to provide adequate educational programs for the targeted students. (Significant, F=.03)

Personal problems (item 11) that classroom teachers may be experiencing was another variable in which there was disagreement. Apparently the teacher aides ($\bar{X}$=4.5) who reported had perceptions toward regular teachers that were not observed by administrators, special teachers, or regular teachers ($\bar{X}$ range = 3.6 to 3.8). (Significant, F=.0003)

Discipline (item 13) was another variable in which the four groups were not in agreement. Regular teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.2) and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.0) appear to place this variable in the lower level of medium causation compared to aides ($\bar{X}$=3.7) and special teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.6) who place it more centrally or higher. Still, all four groups did not rate it above average ($\bar{X}$=3.4).

Teachers not being motivated to grow professionally was the last item in the category of instructional environment in which differences among the groups was obtained. Undoubtedly, the teacher aides ($\overline{X}$=4.5) viewed regular teachers as unmotivated to grow professionally. And, the teachers themselves rated this item as 3.0 or mediumly causative. Special teachers' and administrators' range was 3.3 to 3.6; which may be interpreted to mean that the teacher aides' opinions were responsible for the statistically signficant level (.00002) gained.

Restrictive Elements which Flow from the Administration

Of the 21 items in the instructional category, there were statistically significant differences on 38% of the items among the groups reporting. In the administrative category there were 18 items and 9 (50%) instances of disagreement among the groups (items 3,7,8,9, 10,15,16,17, and 18).

Poor leadership (item 3; significant, .001) was viewed by the teachers and administrators as mediumly causative ($\overline{X}$ range = 3.2 to 3.5). Teacher aides, however, rated this item as a 4.3 or above average in causation. The teacher aides opinions also appeared to be the mean score ($\overline{X}$=3.8) that accounted for the difference among the four groups' opinions toward administrative rules and regulations as being the source for preventing the establishment of appropriate educational settings for mildly handicapped youngsters.

Extracurricular activities as provided by the administrative structure of the school was another variable in which there was statistically significant disagreement among the respondents.

The teachers and aides rated this item in the average range ($\bar{X}$=2.8 to 3.1) but the administrators viewed it as only slightly causative ($\bar{X}$=.01). The difference (F=3.7) was significant as the .01 level.

The physical plant structure as a causative variable was viewed differently by the groups. The range of mean scores for regular teachers and administrators was 2.7 and 2.6 respectively (slightly causative). The special teachers and aides ranked the item at 3.0 and 3.4 (mediumly causative). Even though the level of significant is .033, it is difficult to determine which group (except for aides) is responsible for the difference.

Again, the teacher aides, who are primarily parents without teacher certification, have a view of the schools not shared by teachers and administrators. Poor communication was viewed as above average ($\bar{X}$=4.3) in causation by the aides, but in the average range by the group of educators ($\bar{X}$=3.3 to 3.8). The difference was significant at the .006 level; F=4.17.

The authoritarian style of administrators appeared to be viewed by special teachers and aides as mid to above average in causation ($\bar{X}$=3.5 to 4.1). Regular teachers ($\bar{X}$=2.8) and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.1) did not rate the item as highly; the result was an F of 7.11 which was significant at the .0001 level.

Administative school policies was another item in which discord was found (F=3.6, significant, .012). The administrators rated this item in the slightly causative area ($\bar{X}$=2.7) and the teachers and aides rated in the average area ($\bar{X}$=3.2 to 3.5). However it is difficult to determine just exactly which means account for the significant difference.

Administrative provisions for positive reinforcement of teachers activities was viewed by special teachers and aides as above average in causation ($\bar{X}$=4.1 and 4.5). Classroom teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.4) and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.75) ranked the positive reinforcement as average, but since the administrators' mean was 3.75 it is difficult to determine the group's accounting for the difference other than aides (F=7.01, significant .0002).

Special teachers and aides appeared to be joined in their opinions that administrative views toward discipline was in the upper limits of above average in causation ($\bar{X}$=3.79 to 3.9) while regular teachers and administrators viewed the discipline item as being in the lower range of average ($\bar{X}$=3.2) (F=4.4, significant .004).

Statistically significant differences among the groups of respondents occurred in 38% of the instructional setting variables and 50% of the administrative items. Although there were only 11 items in part 3 of the opinionnaire, there was disagreement among the groups on 45% of those items.

Elements that Flow from Outside the Education Setting

Negative attitudes of members of the community toward the concept of mainstreaming was specified by the teacher aides ($\bar{X}$=4.4) as above average in causation. Special teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.8) ranked the item in the upper limits of average, whereas regular teachers and administrators ranked the item in the mid-range of average ($\bar{X}$=3.3 to 3.5). Only the aides rating can be interpreted as being different (F=5.2, significant .001).

Poor diets was another item in which the special teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.94) and aides ($\bar{X}$=4.2) appeared to agree in opposition to the other two groups ($\bar{X}$=3.5) (F=3.4, significant .01).

Poor attendance was an item viewed by all groups as in the upper average bracket (administrators, $\bar{X}$=3.9) or above average in causation. Although aides and regular teachers rated the item 4.7 and 4.4 respectively, it is difficult to determine the exact group which accounted for the significant difference found (F=4.7, significant .003).

Another item in which there was disagreement was related to time and space for study at home. Special teachers and aides viewed this variable at the above average level (aides $\bar{X}$=4.18; special teachers $\bar{X}$=3.9) whereas the administrators and regular teachers rated it in the midrange of average ($\bar{X}$=3.4 to 3.5). Apparently the F=4.7 (significant .003) resulted from the divisions specified.

Negative peer pressure was another item in which the groups viewed differently (F=2.5, significant .058). The teachers and administrators rated the item from 3.9 to 4.2 whereas the aides rated it as 4.5.

Summary

No attempt was made to interpret the data presented. The reason for the presentation was to provide initial data that could be stored by the reader and used to make final decisions concerning the totality of the data collected. It appears logical at this point to provide one summary table and a subsequent concluding portion to the disagreements found among the respondents.

Table 4 contains the three major categories and subcategories

ENTER TABLE 4 APPROXIMATELY HERE

in which at least one group rated an item as 3.6 (above average in causation) or higher, and in which the F level was significant at .05 level or higher.

It is obvious that the teachers' aides' views of the schools is much different that those of state certified school personnel. However, on 38.4% of the items, special teachers and aides appeared to have similar views toward deterrants to provide appropriate educational settings for mildly handicapped children who have learning problems.

As a group, the aides viewed unmotivated teachers, teachers with personal problems, teachers lack of interest in professional growth, poor administrative leadership, administrative authoratarianism, negative attitudes of community members, and possibly poor attendance differently from the other educators. Yet, all are items that educators themselves may not wish to specify as above average in causation, even though some did.

The teachers' aides who reported were assigned to remedial teachers and are in constant touch with students with learning problems. For that reason it may be unremarkable that special teachers and aides appeared to account for differences between themselves and regular teachers and administrators in their views toward the degree of causation of the administrator's poor communication, lack of the administrators' positive reinforcement, the poor diets of the students, study time and space that is lacking in many homes, and the negative peer pressure found in the schools.

Finally, it may be implied that if there is overt or covert disagreement, for whatever reason, between or among the groups of respondents on any of the items providing a most appropriate educational setting for any child would be difficult indeed. Additionally, on the items in which the teacher aides stood alone in their views, what information are they providing for their peer groups and other community members? The implications are far reaching.

Conclusions

The second portion of the answer to question four, related to variables viewed as sources which deter teachers' abilities to provide most appropriate educational environments to mildly handicapped students with learning problems, may be answered from Table 5. In each column will appear any variable rated as 3.6 or higher by the total group and separate groups of respondents. A discussion will follow.

PLACE TABLE 5 APPROXIMATELY HERE

Two elements that flow from outside the educational setting top the list when the mean ratings were totalled. Apparently, it may be thought that family variables and the children's views of themselves are high among causative variables. High on the list are also variables that are not new to educators. Large classes, negative peer pressure (social problems), inflexible grade level standards, and using the same textbook for all the students in a class appear to be common practices in the schools of which the respondents were familiar.

Although the distance is not great, variables such as teachers' personal problems, tests, lack of teachers' planning, inflexible curriculum requirements, and teachers' inabilities to communicate all were in the top one-fourth (approximately) of the highest ranked causative variables.

Poor attendance (Rank=13) appeared to fall some distance below teachers' personal problems; then, unattended physical problems fell well below that item. From that point, the other variables decreased only slightly in numerical value down to class structure (Rank=21) which had a combined mean rating of 14.7.

Between poor administrative leadership and teachers approach to discipline were variables that only appeared to be above average in causation once or twice; the ramainder of the variables appeared in above average categories only one time. Apparently, those variables were not viewed similarly by the respondents.

Public Law 94-142 was written, in essence, along with House Bill 504 to protect the rights of all children as they pursued educational endeavors. After several years of intensive and extensive preservice educational programs, millions of dollars spent, and untold hours of human labor, the problems that were to be solved through pursuing the spirit and intent of PL 94-142 are still present.

REFERENCES

Abeson, A. The educational least restrictive alternative, Amicus, June, 1977, 23-26.

Ballard, J. Public Law 94-142 and Section 504--Understanding what they are and are not. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978; P. 2.

Fritsch, R. E. Goals and objectives related to mainstreaming exceptional children. The Learner and the Process, 2, March 1981, 14-20.

Hugger, T. A. A Study of secondary classroom teachers' opinions toward mainstreaming e. m. r. students. Unpublished master's degree thesis, Southwest Missouri State University, Springfield, December, 1979.

Mann, P. H. Training teachers to work with the handicapped. The National Elementary Principal, 58, October, 1978, 15-20.

Moore, M. The use of readability formulas by classroom teachers in southwest Missouri. Unpublished master's degree thesis, Southwest Missouri State University, Springfield, December, 1980.

Roubinek, D. L. The best must become better. The Learner and the Process, 2, November, 1980, 3-6.

Table 1

Comparisons of Ozark and Nashville Respondents

Self-Perceptions Concerning Aspects

of P.L. 94-142

N = 80

Item Rated	Ozark		Nashville		t	Signifi-
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	value	cance
1. Child Find	2.62	1.46	2.55	1.64	.214	.83
2. Identification	2.90	1.19	3.25	1.56	1.124	.26
3. Census	2.02	1.47	2.22	1.62	.576	.56
4. Screening	2.92	1.28	3.50	1.33	1.95	.05*
5. Referral	3.20	1.26	3.60	1.35	1.36	.17
6. Diagnosis	2.85	1.18	3.07	1.59	.71	.47
7. Due Process	2.57	1.48	3.30	1.75	1.99	.04*
8. Budget/Finance	1.87	1.58	2.57	1.63	1.94	.05*
9. Degree of LEA Compliance	3.15	1.74	3.87	1.48	1.99	.04*

* Items in which statistically significant differences exist.

Table 2

Rank-Order and Mean Scores
Of Nashville and Ozark
Respondents Knowledge
P.L. 94-142

N=80

Nashville	Mean	Ozark	Mean
Referral	3.60	Referral	3.20
Screening	3.50	Screening	2.92
Due Process	3.30	Identification	2.90
Identification	3.25	Diagnosis	2.85
Diagnosis	3.07	Child Find	2.62
Budget/Finance	2.57	Due Process	2.57
Child Find	2.55	Census	2.02
Census	2.22	Budget/Finance	1.87

Table 3

Display of Beginning and Ending scores for a six-month Period

Tests Administered	Results	
	Beginning October 13	Ending April 16
Nelson Reading Test		
Vocabulary	G.E. 3.5 (77% accuracy)	G.E. 4.4 (98% accuracy)
Comprehension	G.E. 2.0 (50% accuracy)	G.E. 3.1 (83% accuracy)
Diagnostic Reading Scales		
Word Recognition	G.E. 3.8	G.E. 5.5
Oral Reading (100% comprehension; 85% word recognition)	G.E. 3.3	G.E. 3.8
Silent Reading (85% comprehension)	G.E. 4.0	G.E. 5.8
Word Identification Skills	adequate	adequate

OPINIONNAIRE

The Least Restrictive Environment

Please read each of the items in the sections below. Although the sections are different, the response criteria is the same:

5 = highly causative
4 = above average
3 = mediumly causative
2 = slightly causative
1 = non-causative

Section I

Rate the three areas below as to their degree of influence in causing a mildly handicapped student who is mainstreamed into a regular classroom to be in a more restrictive learning environment than when placed in a self-contained special classroom.

	HIGH		MEDIUM		NONE
1. The student's Instructional Program	5	4	3	2	1
2. The school's administrator or the administrative structure of the school	5	4	3	2	1
3. Elements that flow from outside of the educational setting (governmental agencies and environmental forces).	5	4	3	2	1

Section II

Rate the items under the subtopics below as to their degree of influence in causing a student who is mainstreamed, mildly handicapped into a regular classroom to be in a more restrictive learning environment than when placed in a self-contained special classroom.

A. Instructional Program	HIGH		MEDIUM		NONE
1. Inflexible grade level standards	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of knowledge and understanding of handicapping conditions	5	4	3	2	1
3. Meaningless curriculum	5	4	3	2	1
4. Grading system (A, B, C, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Unmotivated teacher	5	4	3	2	1
6. Same textbook for all students	5	4	3	2	1
7. Personality	5	4	3	2	1
8. Class structure	5	4	3	2	1
9. Lack of adequate planning	5	4	3	2	1
10. Communication skills	5	4	3	2	1
11. Personal problems	5	4	3	2	1
12. Failure-based program	5	4	3	2	1
13. Voice	5	4	3	2	1
14. Room arrangement	5	4	3	2	1
15. Tests	5	4	3	2	1
16. Instructional strategies	5	4	3	2	1
17. Grouping patterns	5	4	3	2	1
18. Approach to discipline	5	4	3	2	1
19. Organization of school day	5	4	3	2	1
20. Lack of professional preparation	5	4	3	2	1
21. Teacher not motivated to grow professionally	5	4	3	2	1

B. Administrative Structure	HIGH		MEDIUM		NONE
1. Class size	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of funds	5	4	3	2	1
3. Poor leadership	5	4	3	2	1
4. Low pay	5	4	3	2	1
5. Insisting on single instructional mode	5	4	3	2	1
6. Inflexible schedules	5	4	3	2	1
7. Rules/regulations	5	4	3	2	1
8. Extra curricular activities	5	4	3	2	1
9. Physical plant (structure)	5	4	3	2	1
10. Poor communication	5	4	3	2	1
11. Record keeping requirements	5	4	3	2	1
12. Inflexible curriculum requirements	5	4	3	2	1
13. Lack of pupil personnel services	5	4	3	2	1
14. Textbook policy	5	4	3	2	1
15. Authoritarian administrative style	5	4	3	2	1
16. School policies	5	4	3	2	1
17. Lack of positive reinforcement	5	4	3	2	1
18. Attitude toward discipline	5	4	3	2	1

C. Elements Outside of School Setting	HIGH		MEDIUM		NONE
1. Negative community attitudes	5	4	3	2	1
2. Poor diets (students)	5	4	3	2	1
3. Poor self concepts (students)	5	4	3	2	1
4. Unattended physical conditions (students)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Poor attendance	5	4	3	2	1
6. Inadequate funding	5	4	3	2	1
7. Socio-economic status	5	4	3	2	1
8. Lack of study time/space at home	5	4	3	2	1
9. Negative peer pressure	5	4	3	2	1
10. State requirements	5	4	3	2	1
11. Family instability	5	4	3	2	1

Section III

Your Position or Present Degree
Seeking Status:

Section III

Your Position or Present Degree
Seeking Status:

Regular Class Teacher
Elementary or Secondary ☐

Special Class Teacher
Remedial Reading
E.M.R., L.D., etc. ☐

Administrator ☐

Table 4

Presentation of Specific Items
Rated as Above Average in Causation
In which Disagreement among
Respondents

N = 194

Category Item (Abbreviated)	Total $\bar{X}$	Regular Teacher (RT) $\bar{X}$	Special Teacher (ST) $\bar{X}$	Administrator (A) $\bar{X}$	Teacher Aide (TA) $\bar{X}$	F	SIG.	Possible Source
Instructional								
5. Unmotivated teacher	3.9	3.3	3.9	3.7	4.4	2.7	.04	TA
6. Same textbook	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.6	2.5	.05	TA
11. Teachers' personal problems	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6	4.5	4.7	.00	TA
21. Professional growth/teacher	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.3	4.5	7.0	.00	TA
Administrative								
3. Poor leadership	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.4	4.3	5.5	.00	TA
10. Poor communication	3.7	3.3	3.8	3.5	4.3	4.1	.00	TA,ST
15. Authoritarianism	3.4	2.8	3.5	3.1	4.1	7.1	.00	TA
17. Lack of reinforcement	4.0	3.4	4.1	3.7	4.5	7.0	.00	ST,TA
Outside Elements								
1. Negative attitudes	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.5	4.4	5.2	.00	TA
2. Poor diets	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.5	4.2	3.4	.01	TA,ST
5. Poor attendance	4.2	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.7	4.7	.00	TA,?
8. Study time/space	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.4	4.1	4.7	.00	ST,TA
9. Peer pressure	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.5	2.5	.05	ST,TA?

Table 5
Rank Order of Variables
Above Average in Causation
N = 194

	Variable	$\bar{X}$ Value		Variable	$\bar{X}$ Value
C3	poor self concepts	22.1	A8	class structure	14.7
C11	family instability	21.3	B3	poor administrative leadership	12.4
B1	class size	21.2	C2	poor diets of students	11.9
C9	negative peer pressure	20.8	C8	lack of space/study at home	11.7
A1	inflexible grade level standards	20.0	A20	lack of professional preparation	11.5
A6	same textbook for all students	19.9	C7	socio-economic status	11.3
A2	Lack of teachers knowledge (i.e. handicaps)	19.5	B10	poor administrative communication	8.1
A11	teachers' personal problems	19.2	B18	administrative attitude:discipline	7.6
A15	tests	19.2	A18	teachers' approach: discipline	7.3
A9	lack of adequate planning	18.9	B15	administrative authoritarianism	4.1
B12	inflexible curriculum requirements	18.9	A4	letter grading system	3.9
A10	teachers; communication skills	18.8	A7	teachers' personality	3.8
C5	poor attendance	17.6	B7	administrative rules/regulations	3.8
C4	unattended physical condition	16.3	C10	state requirements	3.8
A5	unmotivated teachers	15.9	B4	low pay of teachers	3.7
C1	negative community attitudes	15.6	B13	lack of pupil services	3.7
B5	single instructional mode	15.3	A3	meaningless curriculum	3.6
B6	inflexible schedules	15.3	A17	grouping patterns	3.6
B2	lack of funds	15.1	A19	organization of schoolday	3.6
A12	failure based program	15.0	C6	inadequate funding	3.6

APPENDIX A

Categorical Ranking of Variables (Abbreviated) Receiving a Rating of Four or More from Respondents

N = 194

Total		Classroom Teachers		Special Teachers		Administators		Teachers Aides	
Item	X	Item	X	Item	X	Item	X	Item	X
Instructional Program									
Totals (X) 3.8	3.8		3.6		3.9		3.9		3.9
6. Same textbook	4.0	1. Inflexible grading	4.3	6. Same textbook	4.2	1. Inflexible grading	3.9	11. personal problem	4.5
1. Inflexible grading	4.0	6. Same textbook	4.2	1. Inflexible grading	4.0	6. Same textbook	3.9	21. Unmotivated professor	4.5
16. Teaching	3.9	2. Knowledge	4.1	5. Unmotivated teacher	3.9	16. teaching	3.8	5. Unmotivated teacher	4.4
5. Unmotivated teacher	3.9	16. Teaching	3.9	16. Teaching	3.8	2. Knowledge	3.8	15. Tests	4.2
2. Knowledge	3.8	4. Grading	3.9	15. Tests	3.8	5. Unmotivated teacher	3.7	20. Preparation	4.2
15. Test	3.8	15. Test	3.8	2. Knowledge	3.8	9. Planning	3.7	16. Teaching	4.1
9. Planning	3.8	11. Personal Problem	3.8	9. Planning	3.8	12. Failure program	3.7	10. Communication	4.1
12. Failure program	3.7	9. Planning	3.7	12. Failue Program	3.7	10. Communication	3.7	2. Knowledge	4.0
10. Communication	3.7	8. Class structure	3.6	10. Communication	3.7	15. Tests	3.6	9. Planning	3.9
11. Personal problem	3.7	10. Communication	3.6	3. Curriculum	3.6	20. Preparation	3.6	12. Failure program	3.9
20. Preparation	3.7			8. Class structure	3.6	11. Personal Problems	3.6	8. Class Structure	3.9
8. Class structure	3.6			18. Discipline	3.6			1. Inflexible grading	3.8
				11. Personal Problems	3.6			7. Personality	3.8
								18. Discipline	3.7
								19. Scheduling	3.6
								6. same textbook	3.6
								17. grouping	3.6

Administrative Structure

Totals (X)	2.9		2.7		3.1		2.8		2.8
1. Class size	4.2	1. Class size	4.4	2. Funds	4.4	8. Extra Curricular	4.4	3. Poor leadership	4.3
17. Reinforcement	4.0	5. Single mode	3.9	1. Class size	4.2	1. Class size	4.1	1. Class size	4.3
2. Funds	3.9	6. Schedule	3.8	17. Reinforcement	4.1	5. Single mode	3.8	10. Communication	4.3
3. Poor leadership	3.8	12. Curriculum	3.7	5. Single mode	3.9	6. Schedules	3.7	15. Authority style	4.1
12. Curriculum	3.8	2. Funds	3.7	12. Curriculum	3.8	17. Reinforcement	3.7	6. Schedule	4.1
4. Low pay	3.7			10. Communication	3.8	12. Curriculum	3.6	5. Single mode	4.1
				6. Schedule	3.7			12. Curriculum	4.0
				18. Discipline	3.7			18. Discipline	3.9
								7. Rules	3.8
								2. Funds	3.7
								13. Services	3.7

Outside of Educational Setting

Totals (X)	3.16		3.2		3.2		2.9		3.1
3. Self concept	4.4	5. Attendance	4.5	3. Self concept	4.4	3. Self concept	4.4	5. Attendance	4.7
11. Family	4.2	11. Family	4.3	11. Family	4.3	11. Family	4.0	3. Self concpt	4.6
5. Attendance	4.2	3. Self concept	4.3	5. Attendance	4.2	9. Peer pressure	3.9	11. Family	4.5
9. Peer pressure	4.1	9. Peer Pressure	4.1	9. Peer pressure	4.2	4. Physical conditions	3.7	9. Peer pressure	4.5
4. Physical problem	4.0	10. State rules	3.8	4. Physical problem	4.3	1. Negative attitudes	3.6	1. Negative attitudes	4.4
2. Diets	3.8			2. Diets	3.9			4. Physical problem	4.3
1. Negative attitudes	3.8			8. Study time	3.9			2. Diets	4.2
8. Study time	3.7			1. Negative attitudes	3.8			8. Study time	4.1
7. Socio-economic	3.6			7. Socio-economic	3.7			7. Socio-economics	4.0
								6. Funding	3.6

Total Means,
Standard Deviations, F's, and Levels of Significance

Total	Total X	Total SD	Reg 1 X	Reg 1 SD	Spec 2 X	Spec 2 SD	Admin 3 X	Admin 3 SD	Aide 4 X	Aide 4 SD	F	SIG
1. Instructional	3.88	1.05	3.61	1.14	3.90	1.13	3.92	.88	3.90	.97	.44	.72
2. Administrator	2.97	1.12	2.77	.88	3.10	1.16	2.84	1.09	2.86	1.20	.95	.41
3. Outside	3.16	1.11	3.22	1.06	3.24	1.09	2.98	1.12	3.18	1.22	.66	.57
Instructional												
1. Inflexible grade level standards	4.04	1.05	4.33	.68	4.06	1.11	3.98	.91	3.86	1.32	.74	.52
2. Lack of knowledge and understanding of hanicapping conditions	3.89	1.02	4.11	.83	3.83	1.04	3.86	1.02	4.04	1.04	.56	.63
3. Meaningless curriculum	3.48	1.22	3.16	1.20	3.68	1.18	3.19	1.18	3.50	1.47	2.32	.07
4. Grading system (A, B, C, etc.)	3.53	1.25	3.94	.99	3.59	1.28	3.51	1.21	2.90	1.37	2.55	.05
5. Unmotivated teacher	3.90	1.17	3.38	1.28	3.95	1.20	3.76	1.13	4.40	1.00	2.79	.04
6. Same textbook for all students	4.09	1.02	4.22	1.00	4.24	.91	3.92	1.02	3.68	1.42	2.51	.05
7. Personality	3.48	1.01	3.05	.99	3.57	.98	3.30	1.00	3.86	1.20	2.88	.03
8. Class structure	3.64	.90	3.66	.97	3.65	.87	3.50	.91	3.90	.97	1.07	.03
9. Lack of adequate planning	3.81	1.04	3.77	1.16	3.83	1.00	3.73	1.01	3.95	1.21	.26	.85
10. Communication skills	3.75	.99	3.61	.77	3.71	1.03	3.71	.95	4.13	.99	1.30	.27
11. Personal problems	3.74	1.02	3.83	.70	3.61	1.14	3.63	.99	4.50	.67	4.73	.00
12, Failure-based program	3.76	1.12	3.55	1.19	3.78	1.18	3.73	1.06	3.95	.89	.44	.72
13. Voice	2.87	1.01	3.00	.97	2.76	1.01	2.84	.97	3.31	1.08	1.92	.12
14. Room arrangement	3.02	1.14	3.11	1.27	3.03	1.07	2.76	1.26	3.50	1.05	2.17	.09
15. Tests	3.87	.99	3.88	.96	3.89	.97	3.69	1.05	4.22	.92	1.52	.20
16. Instructional strategies	3.92	.92	3.94	1.05	3.89	.94	3.88	.78	4.18	1.00	.64	.58
17. Grouping patterns	3.52	1.01	3.44	1.04	3.55	1.01	3.42	.91	3.63	1.25	.33	.80
18. Approach to discipline	3.44	1.08	3.22	1.06	3.61	1.08	3.05	.97	3.72	1.35	3.80	.01
19. Orgainzation of school day	3.19	1.11	3.00	1.28	3.22	1.03	2.98	1.11	3.68	1.32	2.52	.08
20. Lack of professional preparation	3.70	1.12	3.66	1.02	3.63	1.16	3.63	1.02	4.22	1.23	1.77	.15
21. Teacher not motivated to grow professionally	3.60	1.12	3.00	1.32	3.63	1.15	3.38	1.12	4.50	.80	7.04	.00

Total Means, Standard
Deviations, F's, and Levels
of Significance

Total	Total		REG 1		SPEC 2		ADMIN 3		AIDE 4			
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	F	SIG
1. Instructional	3.88	1.05	3.61	1.14	3.90	1.13	3.92	.88	3.90	.97	.44	.72
2. Administrator	2.97	1.12	2.77	.88	3.10	1.16	2.84	1.09	2.86	1.20	.95	.41
3. Outside	3.16	1.11	3.22	1.06	3.24	1.09	2.98	1.12	3.18	1.22	.66	.57
Administrative												
1. Class size	4.24	.90	4.44	.78	4.26	.98	4.11	.75	4.31	.94	.70	.54
2. Lack of funds	3.51	1.13	3.77	1.11	3.42	1.15	3.50	1.03	3.77	1.26	.93	.42
3. Poor leadership	3.58	1.01	3.22	1.06	3.56	.96	3.42	1.14	4.36	.84	5.52	.00
4. Low pay	3.08	1.21	2.83	1.20	3.13	1.20	3.03	1.17	3.18	1.36	.39	.75
5. Insisting on single instructional mode	3.95	1.07	3.94	1.05	3.99	1.05	3.82	1.13	4.13	1.03	.49	.68
6. Inflexible schedule	3.82	1.01	3.83	1.04	3.78	1.03	3.75	1.00	4.18	.95	1.05	.37
7. Rules/regulations	3.38	1.03	3.38	1.09	3.42	1.02	3.09	.99	3.86	1.12	2.95	.03
8. Extra curricular activities	2.87	1.16	2.83	1.04	3.04	1.19	2.42	1.07	3.13	1.32	3.73	.01
9. Physical plant (structure)	2.94	1.07	2.72	.95	3.00	1.10	2.69	1.03	3.45	1.14	2.96	.03
10. Poor communication	3.76	1.00	3.33	1.13	3.82	.94	3.55	1.10	4.31	.89	4.17	.00
11. Record keeping requirements	3.21	1.18	3.50	1.29	3.31	1.16	2.88	1.14	3.31	1.21	2.00	.11
12. Inflexible curriculum requirements	3.82	1.01	3.77	1.30	3.85	.95	3.67	1.07	4.09	.86	.92	.43
13. Lack of pupil personal services	3.33	1.04	3.50	1.15	3.29	1.05	3.19	.99	3.72	.98	1.56	.19
14. Textbook policy	3.08	1.12	3.16	1.46	3.10	1.13	3.00	.99	3.13	1.03	.16	.92
15. Authoritarian administrative style	3.43	1.06	2.83	1.38	3.52	1.10	3.13	.97	4.18	.79	7.11	.00
16. School policies	3.15	1.04	3.22	1.30	3.54	1.07	2.76	.89	3.54	1.01	3.69	.01
17. Lack of positive reinforcement	4.05	.97	3.44	1.54	4.19	.85	3.75	1.04	4.59	.66	7.01	.00
18. Attitude toward discipline	3.60	1.01	3.22	1.16	3.78	1.04	3.26	.86	3.90	1.06	4.45	.00

Total Means,
Standard Deviations, F's, and Levels of Significance

Total	Total		Reg 1		Spec 2		Admin 3		Aide 4			
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	F	SIG
1. Instructional	3.88	1.05	3.61	1.14	3.90	1.13	3.92	.88	3.90	.97	.44	.72
2. Administrator	2.97	1.12	2.77	.88	3.10	1.16	2.84	1.09	2.86	1.20	.95	.41
3. Outside	3.16	1.11	3.22	1.06	3.24	1.09	2.98	1.12	3.18	1.22	.66	.57
Outside Elements												
1. Negative community attitudes	3.80	.97	3.38	.97	3.84	1.02	3.59	.93	4.45	.80	5.22	.00
2. Poor diets (students)	3.82	1.03	3.55	1.29	3.94	1.00	3.51	1.05	4.22	.92	3.43	.01
3. Poor self concepts (students)	4.46	.76	4.38	.84	4.45	.75	4.44	.77	4.68	.71	.67	.56
4. Unattended physical conditions (students)	4.05	.95	4.00	1.13	4.12	.95	3.78	.95	4.36	.78	2.33	.07
5. Poor attendance	4.26	.93	4.44	.85	4.29	.95	3.92	.96	4.77	.86	4.70	.00
6. Inadequate funding	3.49	1.07	3.55	1.09	3.48	1.10	3.44	.91	3.63	1.25	.19	.90
7. Socio-economic status	3.68	1.02	3.33	1.08	3.76	1.03	3.50	.96	4.00	1.11	2.14	.09
8. Lack of study time/ space at home	3.77	1.00	3.50	1.20	3.92	.94	3.40	1.05	4.18	1.00	4.74	.00
9. Negative peer pressure	4.16	.88	4.11	.96	4.22	.83	3.92	.92	4.50	.96	2.52	.05
10. State requirements	3.25	1.07	3.38	.97	3.29	1.10	3.13	1.01	3.27	1.12	.36	.78
11. Family instability	4.27	.83	4.38	.69	4.32	.83	4.03	.88	4.54	.85	2.35	.07